



**REMARKS**

**I. Introduction**

Claims 1-6 are the claims pending in the application. Claims 3-6 have been withdrawn from consideration as belonging to non-elected Group II.<sup>1</sup> Claims 1-2 have been examined and are rejected. Specifically, claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Applicant's Prior Art Disclosure (hereinafter the "PAD").

Applicant traverses the grounds of rejection for claims 1 and 2 as follows.

**II. Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by the PAD.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "a power generation stop terminal for interrupting said on-off control switching section, wherein said power generation stop circuit controls said power generation stop terminal to stop the power generation of said vehicle generator instantaneously when said off detection circuit detects the turning off of said vehicle key switch".

The Examiner alleges that the power generation stop relay 6c discloses the power generation stop terminal, as recited in claim 1 (*see also* Fig. 1, terminal K). In particular, the Examiner alleges that the PAD discloses that the power generation stop relay 6c is for interrupting the on-off control switching section (*see* page 1, lines 15-21; page 2, lines 14-20; and page 3, lines 3-11).

The power generation stop relay 6c of the PAD does not structurally correspond to the power generation stop terminal of claim 1. In the PAD, the power generation stop relay 6c

---

<sup>1</sup> See Applicant's Response dated June 9, 2003.

operates to ground an output terminal L of the auxiliary rectifier 2d to interrupt a field current (page 3, lines 15-17). When the output terminal L of the auxiliary rectifier 2d is grounded by the power generation stop relay 6c, a large current (e.g., > 100 amps) can flow to the auxiliary rectifier 2d as well as the power generation stop relay 6c, requiring these components to have a large current-carrying capacity (page 3, lines 17-25). Furthermore, when such a large current flows through the power generation stop relay 6c, sparks are dangerously generated at the contacts of the power generation stop relay 6c (page 3, lines 25-27). Further still, use of a mechanical relay results in a shortening of the lifetime of the system due to, for example, the wear of the contacts of the mechanical relay (page 3, line 28 to page 4, line 1).

Conversely, the control unit of claim 1 operates to instantaneously stop the power generation of a vehicle generator in a safe manner and without interrupting a large current upon the turning off of a key switch of a vehicle (page 4, lines 3-7). In particular, the power generation stop terminal K removes the need for any power generation stop relay 6c (c.f., Figs. 1 and 5; *see also* page 7, lines 15-17). Thus, when the key switch 4 of the vehicle is turned off, the power generation stop terminal is grounded to cause the vehicle generator 2 to instantaneously stop generating electricity (page 7, lines 18-24).

By using the power generation stop terminal, it is unnecessary to interrupt a large current when the key switch 4 of the vehicle is turned off (page 8, lines 7-8). Consequently, the control unit of claim 1 represents a simpler, more cost-effective system for stopping the power generation of a vehicle generator in a reliable and safe manner (page 8, lines 9-13).



AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No. 10/022,888

Attorney Docket No. Q66962

For at least the above exemplary reasons, the PAD fails to disclose or suggest a power generation stop terminal, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated by the PAD. Consequently, claims 2 is not anticipated by the PAD, at least by virtue of its dependency.

### **III. New Claims 7-10**

Applicants add new claims 7-10 to obtain an expanded scope of protection. Claims 7-10 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

### **IV. Formal Matters**

#### Priority

The Examiner acknowledges Applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, including receipt of the priority document.

#### Cited Reference

The Examiner provides a signed and initialed copy of the Form PTO/SB/08 submitted with Applicant's IDS filed on December 20, 2001, thereby indicating consideration of the reference cited therein.

#### Drawings

The Examiner objects to the drawings as allegedly failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign mentioned in the description: diode 1 (at page 1, paragraph 6). Applicant submits that this discrepancy is due to a typographical error on page 1 of the Specification. Applicant amends the Specification to correct this typographical error such that the diode's reference sign is 1a and is clearly illustrated in Applicant's Fig. 1.

Additionally, the Examiner indicates that Fig. 5 should be designated with a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated (*citing* MPEP § 608.02(g)).

Applicant files concurrently herewith a corrected drawing for Fig. 5 including a "Prior Art" legend.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the objections to the drawings.

#### V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Billy Carter Raulerson  
Registration No. 52,156

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 21, 2003